

-5-

Appin. No. 10/080,070
Amdt. dated July 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 19, 2003

REMARKS

Reexamination of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 12-23 are pending in the application.
Claims 1, 12-15, 19, and 23 have been amended.
Claims 2, 4 and 9-11 have been canceled.

The Office Action

Claims 19, 20, and 23 were objected to for informalities. Claim 19 has been made dependent on claim 15. Claim 23 has been amended to recite the carbonate in milligrams. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the informalities rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §102 (b) as being anticipated by Yasuda, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,692,586).

Claims 9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by Thomas (U.S. Patent No. 3,003,077)

Claims 1-5, 8, 10, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas.

Claims 8, 16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasuda, et al. in view of Thomas.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasuda, et al.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 15, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kemenade, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,164) in view of Yasuda, et al.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas and further in view of "Admitted Prior Art" and Clark (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,209).

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kemenade, et al. and further in view of "Admitted Prior Art" and Clark.

Claim 1 now recites a discharge lamp including an electrode including a current carrying wire and a coil including first, second, and third coiled structures. The second coiled structure is formed by winding the first coiled structure around a second cylindrical member without appreciable overlapping of the coils and has at least 80

-6-

Appl. No. 10/080,070
Amdt. dated July 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 19, 2003

turns per inch. The third coiled structure is formed on a member having a diameter of at least 1.2 mm.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 is to be found in claims 4 and 10, as originally filed, and in the specification, at page 9, paragraph 30.

The references of record do not disclose or fairly suggest such a discharge lamp. Yasuda, et al. disclose a secondary coil in which the pitch is 0.2 mm. This corresponds to only about ten turns per inch, not the at least 80 currently claimed. Further, Yasuda's third mandrel is only 1mm. Thomas discloses winding a coiled structure on a third mandrel which is 26 mils. This is equivalent to about 0.6mm, much less than the at least 1.2 mm presently claimed.

It has unexpectedly been found that by providing a secondary coil of a high TPI and winding it on a third mandrel of large diameter, the amount of emitter material per unit length of secondary coil and the stability of the electrode can be improved. This is not taught or suggested by the references of record.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 12-23 distinguish patentably over the reference of record. An early allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

July 18, 2003
Date

Ann M. Skerry
Ann M. Skerry, Reg. No. 45,655
1100 Superior Avenue
Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2518
216/861-5582

L:\AMSDATA\JUL\jec20610.DOC

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 18 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800